

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

CANDICE L. SMITH, *on behalf of*)
herself and all others similarly situated,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) Case No. 4:23-cv-00821-MTS
)
HUGGINS METAL FINISHING, INC.,)
doing business as Sullivan Precision)
Metal Finishing,)
)
Defendant.)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the Joint Motions for Approval of Settlement. Docs. [40], [43]. Though it is unsettled whether federal law requires judicial approval of all settlements under the Fair Labor Standards Act, *see Barbee v. Big River Steel, LLC*, 927 F.3d 1024, 1026–27 (8th Cir. 2019); *Huff v. Canterbury Park Holding Corp.*, No. 23-3151, 2024 WL 1714257, at *1 (8th Cir. Apr. 22, 2024) (unpublished per curiam), the Court will review the settlements at the parties’ request so as to not leave them in an “uncertain position,” *see, e.g., Tanner v. Empire Financing, Co.*, 4:19-cv-0825-SEP, 2020 WL 7316115, at *1 (E.D. Mo. Dec. 11, 2020); *Van Winkle v. Mick Keane’s Express Delivery Serv., Inc.*, 4:21-cv-1213-NCC, 2022 WL 1122721, at *1 (E.D. Mo. Apr. 14, 2022); *Moore v. Nat’l Vision, Inc.*, 4:23-cv-0593-MTS, 2023 WL 6200780, at *1 (E.D. Mo. Sept. 22, 2023).

After examining the settlement agreements and the parties' filings, the Court concludes that the litigation involves a bona fide dispute and the settlements the parties propose are fair and equitable to each side. *See Tanner*, 2020 WL 7316115 at *1–2; *see also Williams v. BPV Mkt. Place Invs., LLC*, 4:14-cv-1047-CAS, 2014 WL 5017934, at *2 (E.D. Mo. Oct. 7, 2014). Thus, the Court will approve the parties' joint proposed settlements.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Joint Motions for Approval of Settlement Agreement, Docs. [40], [43], are **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall submit appropriate dismissal papers no later than **Monday, January 06, 2025**.

Dated this 6th day of December 2024.



MATTHEW T. SCHELP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE